

9

THE

BOOT ON THE OTHER LEG:

OR,

LOYALTY ABOVE PARTY.



PHILADELPHIA:
PRINTED FOR GRATUITOUS DISTRIBUTION.

1863.

ANYTHING RATHER THAN SEPARATION.

If our ship of state were constructed with the East, West, North and South, in distinct compartments,—each complete and seaworthy in itself,—or rather if the States composing our Union were like a raft of thirty-four sawmill logs, or coal barges, coupled together for a temporary purpose and strung along behind some political steam-tug to be taken to market, everybody would see that their separation was an event expected and intended.

But no intelligent and unprejudiced looker-on can survey our noble ship as she now lies, the “observed of all observers,” without a conviction that her safety is in her integrity; that she must float or sink *as a whole*; that she is in the very nature of things, an *entirety*; that separation is destruction. The absolute indispensableness of such a feeling to our safe deliverance from present perils, is well set forth in the following from the *New York Times*.

SUPPORT OF THE UNION.

“Upon one most important point our people seem to be, just at present, absolutely unanimous—men of all parties seem to agree that, whatever else may happen, the *Union must be preserved*. We hear nothing now, from any quarter, of letting the South go in peace. Six months or a year ago there were thousands among us who were half inclined to regard the attempt to quell the rebellion as hopeless, and who were more than half inclined to end the war by conceding independence to the Southern States. We hear no such talk now. Even those who are most impressed by the magnitude of the struggle, and by the sacrifice which it costs to carry it on, seem to have become satisfied that, if there is no way out of it except by disunion, it must be continued indefinitely.

“This change in the public temper is the natural result of a public instinct. The people have come to see that a division of the Union is the destruction of the nation. We can live under a bad government; but we cannot live without a country. It is easy to say that, even if the South were to become

[See page 3 of Cover.]

THE
BOOT ON THE OTHER LEG:

OR,

LOYALTY ABOVE PARTY.



PHILADELPHIA:
PRINTED FOR GRATUITOUS DISTRIBUTION.
1863.

N O T E.

It is an old saying that "times change and men change with them." It would be difficult to find an instance in which the proverb is more strikingly verified, than that which we now present.

The last war with Great Britain was declared and prosecuted under a Democratic administration. The Federal party, as it was then called, did not approve of the measure and manifested their disapprobation, and even hostility, in various forms, not unlike those which are favoured now by the opposers of the present government.

MATTHEW CAREY, a Jefferson-Democrat, indignant at the principles and policy maintained by the opposition and regarding the duty of sustaining the government as paramount to all other human obligations, prepared and published "The Olive Branch," in which he set forth, in a striking manner, the mischievous course of policy adopted by the disaffected party, and exhibited and enforced what he regarded as the duty of every citizen.

The larger part of the paragraphs which follow are extracted from that work, which passed through some ten or twelve editions, and may properly be regarded as the voice of the Democracy of the country at that time. How far the same voice gives the same sound now, the reader can judge. If our ears serve us, the words we hear from such democrats as Joseph A. Wright, Andrew Johnson, J. T. Brady, D. S. Dickenson, John Van Buren and others, would find no place on the disloyal lips of such as Vallandigham, Wood, and T. H. Seymour.

If the loyal Democrats of 1814 were positively right, the disloyal Democrats of 1863 must be superlatively wrong.

THE BOOT ON THE OTHER LEG:

OR,

LOYALTY ABOVE PARTY.

There have been three marked eras in the history of parties in this country under our present Constitution.

FIRST ERA.

When the Federalists were in power and the Democrats opposed them.

Near the close of the last century, the administration was involved in difficulties with the French government, and a formidable opposition to its measures was raised by those who were called the "partisans of France." It was then that the famous sedition law was passed, the marrow of which was that "if any persons shall combine or conspire together to oppose any measure or measures of the Government of the United States, which shall be directed by the proper authority, they shall be subject to a fine not exceeding five thousand dollars, and to be imprisoned not less than six months, nor more than five years."

As a sample of the exhortations which were then given by the friends of the government to its factious opposers, the following may suffice :



WHAT A FEDERAL LEGISLATURE OF 1798 THOUGHT OF THE DUTY OF SUPPORTING THE ADMINISTRATION.

(By the House of Representatives of New Hampshire.)

As the Constitution of the government was framed by the wisest and best men—was adopted after a candid discussion, and upon mature deliberation, without violence or tumult, it belongs to us to repose proper confidence in the officers of our own choice, and willingly afford effective aid to that government which we have instituted for the common good. The beneficial effects of the Constitution of the United States have been generally felt and acknowledged to be far greater than were at first expected. A spirit of inquiry into the principles of a government, and the mode of its administration, pertains to a free people. But when the spirit becomes intemperate and its designs are to promote opposition, to divide and weaken the government, it may embolden foreign powers to invade our rights, and embarrass the measures necessary to obtain redress—whenever such a restless, uneasy temper appears, we will lend our firmest aid to discourage and correct it.

WHAT A MASS MEETING OF 1798 THOUGHT OF THE DUTY OF SUSTAINING THE ADMINISTRATION.

(From an Address of a Meeting held at Elizabethtown, New Jersey, September, 1798.)

United we are able to protect ourselves without any foreign aid against all attacks from abroad. But agitated by factious opposition to our government,  which is our only rallying point against danger,  and weakened by internal dissensions, we invite the invasion of foreign powers, expose ourselves to fall an easy prey or to form unequal alliances for our safety. Let us seriously ask ourselves who do most towards increasing our expenses and our taxes—inviting the invasion of foreign powers; weakening our means of defence, and driving us to form European alliances—whether they who are active to promote union, to support government, to prepare to repel hostility, or those who busily engender divisions, revile our own government, indiscriminately censure, and (as far as they dare) oppose all its acts, refuse to repair to its standard, endeavour to paralyze all its efforts, and encourage every disposition to sedition.

* * * * The time has at length come, when all inferior disputes are to be laid aside, or to be offered a sacrifice

for the general good. Whatever the objections, if any, we have had against any part of the acts of our administration ought to be entirely suppressed, or at least suspended, till the dangers that threaten us from without are overcome or vanquished. In this great object of general concern and safety, we have one common and *inseparable interest*, and should therefore unite in one common language and exertion."

WHAT THE PULPIT OF 1798 THOUGHT OF THE DUTY OF SUSTAINING THE ADMINISTRATION.

(From an Address to the President by a Convention of Ministers of the Gospel, May, 1798.)

We remember Christ's command to forgive and love our most injurious enemies, but neither the law of Christianity nor of reason requires us to prostrate our national independence, freedom, property, and honour, at the feet of proud, insatiable oppressors. Such a prostration would be treason against that Being who gave us our inestimable privileges, civil and religious, as a sacred deposit to be defended and transmitted to posterity. It would be criminal unfaithfulness and treachery to our country, our children, and the whole human race. The intimate connection between our civil and Christian blessings is alone sufficient to justify the decided part which the clergy of America have uniformly taken in supporting the constituted authorities and political interests of their country.

(From a Sermon by the father of our distinguished fellow-citizen who invented the Magnetic Telegraph.)

Our government,—itself the most perfect, the best administered, the least burthensome, and most happifying to the people, of any on earth,—is yet steadily opposed in all its important measures, and regular and continued efforts are made to stop its wheels. * * *

As citizens, we ought with one heart to cleave to and support our own government. It is the government of our own forming, and administered by men of our own choice, and therefore claims our confidence and support. We ought to rebel with indignation every suggestion and slanderous insinuation calculated to weaken a just confidence in the rectitude of the intentions of our constituted authorities. All such insinuations at this critical period proceed from an influence hostile to our peace, and, if permitted to have their intended effect, may accomplish the purpose of our enemies in our division and the overthrow of our government.

SECOND ERA.

When the Democrats were in power and the Federalists opposed them.

“Madison’s war,” as it was called, (meaning our last war with Great Britain,) was provoked by a series of measures which nothing could justify. But the rancorous spirit of party prevented a hearty and unanimous acquiescence of the people in its justice. Those who favoured the war, were supposed to sympathize with the views of the Emperor of the French,* and those who opposed it were regarded as truckling to Great Britain, while they were false to the rights and honour of their own government.

WHAT THE PEACE MEN OF 1814 THOUGHT ABOUT THE WAR.

The New England States embraced the largest part of the anti-war party, and adopted resolutions and initiated measures, which were well fitted to embarrass and discourage the administration in the work they had in hand. They opposed conscription. They tried to destroy the government credit. The President was threatened with expulsion from office. A secession of the Eastern States was advocated; the “dissolution of the present confederacy, and the erection of separate governments” was threatened, the “commercial states” were summoned to “breast the shock;” “all party bickering,” it was said, “must be sacrificed on the altar of patriotism. Then, and not till then, shall they (the commercial States) humble the pride and ambition of Virginia, whose strength lies in their weakness, and chastise the insolence of those madmen of Kentucky and Tennessee, who aspire to the government of these States, and threaten to involve the country in all the horrors of war.” The cry of the anti-war party, then, was, “Restore the Constitution to its purity. Abolish every

* The Senate of one of the New England States declared that “the war was founded in falsehood, declared without necessity, and that its real object was to aid the late tyrant of Europe (Napoleon) in his view of aggrandisement.”

tyrannical law. Make an immediate and honourable peace. Revive our commerce. * * * Unless you comply with these just demands, without delay, we will withdraw from the Union, scatter to the winds the bonds of tyranny, and transmit to posterity, that liberty purchased by the revolution."*

A resolution was introduced into one of the Eastern Legislatures, for the appointment of a Committee, "to confer with all the New England States, to repair to Washington, and personally make known to the President the general opinion of the New England States as to the present war, and the manner in which it has been conducted; and to inform him, that he must either resign his office, or remove those ministers and officers who have, by their nefarious plans, ruined the nation."

We need not enter into farther detail to show the spirit of the opposition. Let us now advert to the feeling with which it was regarded.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS OF 1814 THOUGHT ABOUT THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS.

The insurrectional and treasonable doctrine of a separation of the States was publicly advocated in some of the Gazettes at the Eastward, and (wonderful and shameful to tell!) preached from the pulpit. The publications and sermons having a direct tendency to the destruction of social order, and the introduction of civil war, demanded the severe animadversion of the officers of the government. It was the incumbent duty of the President to have had the laws put in force, in order to repress the offences and punish the offenders. * * * A re-enactment and enforcement of the sedition law were imperiously required, and the good sense of the nation would have supported the measure which the public welfare rendered so necessary.

It may be fairly averred, that there is no country in the world but the United States, in which an open attempt to subvert the government, and tear down the pillars of society, would have escaped condign punishment. Every society ought to possess within itself, and vigorously to exercise, whenever occasion calls for it, the fundamental principle of self-preservation.

* Northern Grievances set forth in a Letter to James Madison, by a North American. Published May, 1814, p. 4, cited in the Olive Branch, 10th edition, p. 41.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS OF 1814 THOUGHT OF UNION LEAGUES.

To counteract the influence of such appeals, the war party organized Union Societies, the nature and design of which will be best shown by extracts from the form of their constitution :

Whereas, many disaffected persons have long laboured to prepare the public mind for a dissolution of the Union, and the formation of separate confederacies ; And whereas, they have at length publicly and daringly avowed their flagitious purposes ; And whereas, the experience of all history to the present time, affords the most complete proof that such dissolutions of existing forms of government, and the formation of new ones, have almost invariably produced bloody civil wars—the greatest curse that ever afflicted mankind ; And whereas, the present form of the general government, if duly supported by our citizens, is calculated to produce as high a degree of happiness as has ever fallen to the lot of any nation ; And whereas, the separate confederacies contemplated as substitutes for the present general confederacy, even if it were possible to establish them peaceably, would be pregnant with interminable future wars, such as have almost constantly prevailed between neighbouring States, with rival interests real or supposed, and would hold out every possible inducement and every desirable facility to foreign nations to array each against the other, and thus subjugate the whole, or at least render them dependent upon or subservient to those foreign nations ; And whereas, finally, it would be absolute madness to throw away the incalculable blessings we enjoy, for the mere chance of bettering our condition, and still more for the absolute certainty of making it worse : Therefore, Resolved, that we associate, &c.

Among the articles of the constitution are these :

I. We solemnly pledge ourselves to support, by every honourable and legal means in our power, the existing form of the general government.

II. That we will use our utmost endeavours to counteract, as far as in our power, all plots for the dissolution of the Union.

III. That we will correspond and cheerfully co-operate with all individuals and bodies of men, in all parts of the Union, who have the same views with us on the object embraced in the second article, *however they may differ from us on other political topics.* And after providing for the choice of officers,

&c., it is made the duty of the Committee of Correspondence to expose to public abhorrence, the various plans that have been adopted, from time to time, to effect the parricidal purpose of dissolving the Union, to place in the strongest point of light the advantages of our blessed form of government, with the tremendous consequences of civil war, and (the inevitable result of a separation) our being instruments in the hands of the great powers of Europe to annoy, ravage, depopulate, slaughter, and destroy each other.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS OF 1814 THOUGHT ABOUT STATE RIGHTS.

In the Convention that formed the Federal Constitution, the Democratic party sowed the seeds of a premature dissolution of that instrument, and of the American Confederacy. Regarding society more as it ought to be than as it is, has ever been, or is ever likely to be; seduced by theories more plausible than solid; applying to a free elective government deriving all its powers and authorities from the voice of the people, maxims and apprehensions and precautions calculated for the meridian of Monarchy,—they directed all their efforts and all their views towards guarding against oppression from the Federal government.* * This was the horrible monster which they laboured to cripple and chain down to prevent its ravages. The State governments they regarded with the utmost complacence, as the public protectors against this dreadful enemy of liberty. Alas! little did they suppose that our grand danger would arise from the usurpations of the State governments; some of which have since most awfully and treasonably jeopardized the Union. Unfortunately, this party was too successful in the Convention. Its energy and ardent zeal produced a Constitution which, however admirably calculated for a period of peace, has been found incompetent, in war, to call forth at once and decisively the energies of the nation, and the administration of which has been repeatedly bearded, baffled and thwarted by the State governments.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS OF 1814 THOUGHT OF THE WAR POWER OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Every attempt to carry this power into operation in the mode most efficient and least burdensome, was opposed and defeated by men of high standing, great talents and professing

a sacred regard to the honour and interests of their country ! And the whole of the opposition rested on the absurd, the untenable ground of the measure being “*unconstitutional*.” And this wretched pretext was blindly admitted and defended by a large portion of our citizens.

In the Congressional debate on the bill to raise a military force, a member of the House of Representatives said : “ I beseech you as friends of humanity to spare the tears which the passage of this bill will cause to flow. I appeal to you as fathers by every endearing tie which binds you to your children, not to deprive the aged parent of the child of his youth, the support and solace of his declining years, lest you bring his gray hairs with sorrow to the grave. I entreat you to make the case your own ! Suppose a darling child, an only son, snatched from you by the scourge of war, in the language of grief and nature, you would exclaim, ‘ Would to God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son ! ’ ”

This was the miserable rant by which our fathers and our mothers, our wives and our children, our towns and our cities, were deprived of protection, and, but for the peace, would have been delivered defenceless to the enemy.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS OF 1814 THOUGHT OF MONEY MATTERS.

Money has long been proverbially styled the sinews of war. Soldiers cannot be raised nor put in motion, nor arrayed in the field of battle without money to clothe and feed them. A government at war and destitute of funds or credit must succumb to its adversary, bend the neck to the yoke, make humble submission and receive the law from the conqueror. Shortly after the declaration of war there was a combination formed to prevent the success of the government loans. Every possible exertion was made to deter the citizens from subscribing to the loans, in order to disable the government from carrying on the war, and of course compel it to make peace. But the loans, in spite of the press and the pulpit, and the efforts of the conspirators, succeeded to their infinite mortification.

The consequence of these vile operations was long and severely felt. Many estimable individuals were absolutely ruined. Bank paper* became an object of brokerage, and was sold at various rates, from three to twenty-five† per cent. discount. A general stagnation was produced. The loss fell

* Gold in our time.

† Not seventy-four !

most heavily on the poor, as is usual in all such cases. The rich were enabled to make most extravagant profits, and many of them were literally preying on the middle and poorer classes of society. And thus, in a season of distress and difficulty, the embarrassments of the citizens were doubled and trebled. And what is the most daring and profligate part of the business, the men who

“Played these pranks before high heaven,”

were impudent enough to charge the whole distress to the administration!

“The offence is rank, it smells to heaven.”

* * * The enemies of the administration were lavish in their reproaches, in the early stages of the war, on its ill success, which to many of them was a subject of as much triumph as if they belonged to a hostile nation—as if whatever honour or disgrace might arise from it, were to attach themselves wholly to the administration!

Let those infatuated men who caught the government by the throat and almost strangled it, by the destruction of its credit, and by shackling all its efforts, only reflect for a few moments, calmly, on the effect of their conduct. They desired peace, but they really prolonged the war. If notwithstanding the immense disadvantages under which it was conducted, through the disaffection of such a large body of our citizens, we so harassed and crippled the trade of the enemy, what would have been the result had the united energies of the nation been employed to avenge the national wrongs? * * * Millions of debts and taxes would have been saved, and thousands of lives on both sides been preserved. * * * This is an awful view of the labours of the “*peace party*.”

THE APPEAL OF A DEMOCRAT OF 1814 TO THE OPPOSERS OF THE GOVERNMENT.

I plead not for Democracy; I plead not for Federalism; these differences have sunk into utter insignificance. Were the contest between them, I should not have stained a single sheet of paper. I plead against jacobinism; I plead against faction; I plead against attempts to overawe and control the constituted authorities; I plead the cause of order, of government, of civil and religious liberty; I plead for the best constitution the world ever saw. The Constitution may be imperfect. Every thing human partakes of human infirmity and human error. It has

provided a proper mode of amendment. As soon as peace is restored and the fermentation of public passions has subsided, let the real or supposed defects be brought fairly forward, and submitted to the State Legislatures or to a convention as may be judged proper. But while the vessel of State is on rocks and quicksands, let us not madly spend the time which ought to be devoted to secure her and our salvation in the absurd and ill-timed attempt to amend, or in other words to destroy, the charter party under which she sails.

It is an easy process to raise commotions and provoke seditions, but to allay them is always arduous, often impossible. Ten men may create an insurrection, which an hundred of equal talents and influence may be utterly unable to suppress. The weapon of popular discontent, easily wielded at the outset, becomes, after it has arrived at maturity, too potent for the feeble grasp of the agents by whom it has been called into existence. It hurls them and those against whom it was first employed, into the same profound abyss of misery and destruction.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS OF 1814 THOUGHT ABOUT THE ONLY MODE OF DEALING WITH TREASON AND TRAITORS.

In every science there are some great leading truths which cannot be controverted. And in political economy there is no maxim more indubitable than this, that treason never was and never will be propitiated BY FORBEARANCE. Since the world was formed never did a conspiracy meet with the same degree of immunity. "Our Palinurus slept at the helm." The mutineers had full scope for their activity. They made their arrangements at leisure, as undisturbedly as if they were engaged in promoting the salvation of the State. To whatever cause this neglect may be ascribed, whether to torpor, inactivity, or reliance on the good sense of the nation, it casts an indelible stain on the administration of Mr. Jefferson.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS OF 1814 BELIEVED TO BE THE DUTY OF ALL GOOD CITIZENS TOWARDS THE GOVERNMENT.

Our Constitution has probably but one material defect. It wants a due degree of energy, particularly pending war. If it were free from this, it might endure as many ages as the

Spartan or Roman governments. This defect must be a subject of deep and serious regret to all good men. * * * It renders it the imperious duty of all good citizens to uphold and support it (the government) with all their energy. But all considerations of duty apart, mere selfishness ought to prompt those who have any interest in the welfare of the country, who may lose but cannot gain by convulsions and tumults and confusion and anarchy, with all their efforts to uphold the government which protects them in the enjoyment of all the blessings of life.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS OF 1814 THOUGHT OF CONSCRIPTION.

Towards the close of the war an attempt was made in Congress to employ in the defence of the nation, a portion of the militia in a mode the most simple, the most practicable, the most efficient, and at the same time the least burdensome that was ever adopted in any country. * * * Against this noble system of defence—so equitable, so just, so unexceptionable, so adequate to its end, so easy and free from burden to our citizens, so likely to bring the war to a close by convincing the enemy of the impossibility of making any impression on us, there was a most hideous outcry raised in and out of Congress—an outcry highly disgraceful and factious. It was branded with the odious name of Conscription, and identified with the French system whereby the whole male population of France was subject to the despotic will and pleasure of the Executive. To the passions of the people the most inflammatory appeals were made. Many of our citizens were, by unceasing efforts led to believe that the plan was wholly unprecedented in this country—that it was utterly unconstitutional and pernicious, and that it was intended as the basis of a military despotism. And to such an awful extent was the frenzy carried, that open resistance was publicly threatened. It is hardly possible to conceive of a more awful or more disgraceful delusion. Never were the public gullibility and credulity more miserably played upon.

THIRD ERA.

When Democrats, Federalists, Whigs, Republicans, and all other pre-existing parties were united in the Administration and the Copperheads opposed them.

The incidents distinguishing this era, are so recent as to be familiar to all persons. The rupture in the Democratic party, and the presentation of four candidates for the executive chair, opened the way for the nomination and election of the present President. In his support various parties united who had before been separated. His election, though its constitutionality could not be questioned, was regarded by the Slave States as a token of their waning influence in the councils of the country, and was made the ostensible occasion of the revolt of one after another of them, and the virtual declaration of war against the loyal States of the Union. The execution of the laws was resisted, the insurrection began to assume a formidable magnitude, and the invasion of the national capital was threatened ; and when forbearance ceased to be a virtue, the call was made for a military force to execute the laws, suppress the insurrection, and repel the threatened invasion. At first there was a spirited, patriotic response, but soon the restless spirit of faction, with its flashing eyes and forked tongue, came abroad ; political and party interests usurped the place that patriotism claimed ; and though the great heart of a loyal people still beats strong and steady,—stronger and steadier every day and every hour,—there is no doubt that our domestic enemies, in this era, like foreign enemies in those which preceded it, have gathered spirit and confidence from whatever of indifference and hostility is manifested to the government or its measures.

THE COPPERHEADS IN COUNCIL.

At the mass meeting held at the Cooper Institute, in New York, April 7, called to express their opposition to the "Con-

script Act," and to the administration, the following sentiments were expressed and more or less loudly applauded :

The country is in a revolution, aye, in two revolutions: a revolution at the South, prosecuted by the sword, and a revolution at the North, prosecuted by legislative and executive usurpation. The latter is more insidious, more destructive, more to be feared by the people, than the former.

It is the latter effort, to revolutionize our government and to destroy our institutions, that we are met to resist.

* * * * *

I could almost say, with propriety, that the whole history of this administration has been more a war of aggression upon the Constitution and the rights of the people of the North, than it has been powerful to do any injury to the people of the South.

* * * * *

This war is, in my opinion, an unconstitutional war, carried on for destroying a large property-interest in a large portion of the country, instead of giving security to property as the Constitution designed the government should do.

* * * * *

In my view this war, nominally for the Union, has actually been waged against it. With that belief, rather than prolong it, I would concede a separation as the only means of an ultimate re-union upon such principles as a true republic should entertain. Animosities have been engendered, and conflicting principles have been developed by hostilities to an extent that renders re-union in the present state of feeling an event to shrink from, as unnatural.

* * * * *

It is time that reason should sit in judgment, taking counsel only from humanity. We invoked the spirit of war to save—it came but to destroy. Our treasuries are emptied. Our posterity will be cursed with a crushing debt.

* * * * *

Graves in our valleys; sufferers in our hospitals; desolation at every hearth-stone; distrust in our rulers; distrust in ourselves; bankruptcy, anarchy, and ruin—these are the triumphs won by your relentless policy.

Such a factious, disorganizing, traitorous spirit as these sentiments breathe, has been rebuked (as we have seen) by both the great political parties into which our country was

divided, previous to the present era, and it can and will find no favour or countenance now, except with political demagogues or their pliant tools.

The instruction to be derived from the parallels we have thus run between the spirit and position of the anti-war parties of 1798 and 1814, and the anti-war party of 1863, is sufficiently apparent, but there is a prodigiously wide difference between the two past eras and the present. There might be an honest variance in the opinions of men respecting a war with a foreign nation, though it could furnish no apology for neglecting any of the duties of allegiance to the constitutional government of the country. But when the national life is assailed, as it is now, by domestic violence; when those who have sworn fealty to the government plot its overthrow; when a stupendous armed resistance is made to the national authority, threatening to remove the only barrier that protects us from anarchy and ruin,—to stand aloof then, to stickle about forms and points of law at such a crisis, and above all, to thwart, oppose, or discourage the operations of the powers that be, argues such an hostility to the peace and safety of the country, as should forfeit any and every claim which the disloyal citizen might otherwise assert to the protection of its government.

If the peace politicians of 1798 and 1814 sinned so grievously in refusing to stand by the government of the country when the contest involved only international policy or rights, by what standard shall we measure the guilt of peace politicians in 1863, who array themselves against their own government when it is straining every nerve to protect the nation from those who have “bound themselves with an oath” to take its life?

independent, we should still have left the elements of a powerful nation. That is true—but we should have lost the only thing which can combine these elements, and weld their separate strength into national sovereignty and imperial power. We should have lost the sentiment of nationality, the binding force of the Constitution, the powerful charm that lives in the aspirations of a people for national grandeur. Each section and each State would be thrown back upon calculations of its own interest, and, in the absence of the stronger motive, its action would be decided by them. The South in possession of the Lower Mississippi, the West would have to consider through which channel it could best find access to the sea. The central States would seek the best market for their surplus products. Pennsylvania would go where she could best sell her iron and her coal. Each locality would consult its own conviction of its own separate and distinct interest.

“The Union saves us from all this. It blends all interests into one common interest, and affords, moreover, for each the largest possible scope for its own development. Under the Union, each section has access to all the others, and transit through them all without obstacles of any kind. The West can seek the sea by the Mississippi or by the Lakes. She can seek her markets at the South or in the East or in Europe. Pennsylvania and New England find free access to every section where their manufactures are required. And the combined power of all the sections is at the service of each one for protection from internal violence, and for defence against the world. The instinct of the American people fastens upon this as the only condition of national greatness and prosperity. It recognizes the Union as an absolute *necessity*, and will insist upon its preservation, therefore, at all hazards and at whatever cost.

“This is a great point gained. So long as there was any considerable portion of our people willing to ‘let the South go,’ we were in danger of national ruin. So long as anything else was regarded as of more importance than the preservation of the Union,—so long as the maintainance of slavery, or the abolition of slavery, the writ of *habeas corpus*, or freedom of speech, was held to be more important than the salvation of the Union, we were exposed to very serious peril. We regard that danger as past.”

